

REMARKS

Following entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 26 and 29 to 43 will be pending in the application. Claim 26 has been amended, new claims 29 to 43 have been added, and claims 1, 4 to 24, 27, and 28 have been canceled, herein. Support for the amendment of claim 26 is found throughout the specification as originally filed, including, for example, page 13, lines 22 to 25. Support for claims 29 to 43 is found throughout the specification as originally filed, including, for example, the portions identified in the table below.

Claim	Exemplary support in the specification as originally filed
29	Page 13, lines 25 to 29
30	Page 8, lines 21 to 24
31	Page 13, lines 24 to 25
32	Original claim 14
33	Original claim 15
34	Page 8, line 27 to page 9, line 5
35	Page 8, line 27 to page 9, line 5
36	Page 13, lines 22 to 25
37	Page 13, lines 22 to 25
38	Page 8, lines 21 to 24
39	Page 13, lines 24 to 25
40	Original claim 14
41	Original claim 15
42	Page 8, line 27 to page 9, line 5
43	Page 8, line 27 to page 9, line 5

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of record in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Alleged Lack of Enablement

Claims 1, 4, 17, 18, and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the enablement requirement because the specification allegedly fails to enable those skilled in the art to make and use the full scope of the subject matter encompassed by the cited claims without undue experimentation. Without conceding the correctness of the assertion, and to advance prosecution, claims 1, 4, 17, 18, and 28 have been canceled, obviating the rejection.

Alleged Obviousness

A. Claims 1, 4, 17, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Chien, et al., *J. Pharm. Sci.* 78, 1989, 376-383 (“the Chien article”) in view of Sage, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,494,679 (“the Sage patent”), Märki, et al., *Hoppe-Seyler's Z. Physiol Chem* 360, 1979, 1619-1632 (“the Märki article”); Green, et al., *Pharmaceutical Res* 8, 1991, 1121-1127 (“the Green article”); and Voet, et al., *Biochemistry*, 1990, John Wiley and Sons, New York (“the Voet text”). Without conceding the correctness of the assertion, and to advance prosecution, claims 1, 4, 17, 18, and 28 have been canceled, obviating the rejection.

B. Claim 26 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Kumar, et al., *Proc Intern Symp Control Rel Bioact Mater* 17, 1990, 435-436 in view of the Sage patent, Vale, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,494, 679 (“the Vale patent”) and the Voet text. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, and to advance prosecution, claim 26 has been amended to recite methods for delivering a pharmaceutical polypeptide agent through a body surface that comprise providing a synthetic analog of a human growth hormone releasing hormone having at least one glutamine residue at position 16, 30, 31, or 36 replaced with a histidine residue, and delivering the analog through the body surface by electrotransport. The cited references, when considered alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest such methods, and, accordingly, fail to render such methods obvious. Applicants accordingly, respectfully, request withdrawal of the rejection.

DOCKET NO.: ALZA-0879 (ARC2179CON)
Application No.: 10/016,403
Office Action Dated: May 31, 2006

PATENT

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the foregoing constitutes a complete and full response to the Office Action of record. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 21, 2006

/Jane E. Inglese/
Jane E. Inglese, Ph.D.
Registration No. 48,444

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439